

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/043,165	01/14/2002	Kenji Terao	Q68079	5038	
7590 02/07/2006			EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE N	MION, PLLC ania Avenue, NW	GHULAMALI, QUTBUDDIN			
	DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2637		
		*.	DATE MAIL ED. 02/07/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ali
-----

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/043,165	TERAO, KENJI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Qutub Ghulamali	2637		

	Qutub Ghulamali	2637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		26(a) and the annuario	to outonien for			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL		Classic district Access and another	an af the date of			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ie appeal. Since			
	had a single the date of filling a brint	will not be entered b				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	/· Ilowahla if submitted in a senarate	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	nowable if submitted in a separate,	timery med amendm	sin cancoming the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1-3,5,6,8-11,18 and 19.		ll be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13-15, 20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will no	ot be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
		$\wedge$	<b>1</b> .			
		( m. ( JEAN B. PRIMAF	CORRIELUS LY EXAMINER			

2-2-06

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet The applicant alleges that Hiramatsu does not search and detect a signal power within a selected region. The examiner disagrees. The examiner conducted a thorough review and concludes that as noted in the Final Office Action, the art of Hiramatsu discloses every feature of the claimed invention including detection of signal power within a selected region (prescribed region) (col. 3, lines 29-36; col. 4, lines 11-26; col. 6, lines 46-67) and does disclose searching of a delay profile with a prescribed timing (see col. 6, lines 59-63). The examiner concludes that Hiramatsu therefore, discloses all limitation of the claim rendering the applicant's argument/remarks moot.